



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/132,593 08/11/98 SAEBO

A 21440/9015

EXAMINER

HM22/0824

J. MITCHELL JONES  
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP  
220 MONTGOMERY STREET  
SUITE 2200  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

WANG, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED:

08/24/01

69

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/132,593	SAEBO ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Shengjun Wang	<b>Art Unit</b> 1617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 July 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Double Patenting rejections.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-8.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

RUSSELL TRAVERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 1-8 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 for reasons set forth in the prior office action. Applicants' arguments submitted July 30, 2001 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. Applicants' asserted that the examiner have not responded fully to applicants' extensive arguments. The particular amounts of CLA in animal food is suggested in example 1-4 of Cook '646, as cited in the first office action and repeated in the final action. the two isomers claimed herein are predominant in Cook'646. Column 4, lines 50-55. Claims herein are direct to composition or animal feed differ from the cited prior art in particularly specifying the amount of 'impurity'. The prima facie case have been established as set forth in the prior office action particularly because the difference between the prior art and the claimed invention only involve impurity. Note applicants have the burden of showing that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed products. Further, applicants' have the burden of showing unexpected benefit of the claimed products. See, Ex Parte Gray, 10, USPQ2d 1922 (BOPP 1989 @ 1925-1926). The evidence presented by applicants for showing the difference between the prior art and the instant invention is not persuasive as discussed in the first office action mailed November 28, 2000. Applicants' have not presented any evidence to show the unexpected benefit of the instant invention.